

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed May 25, 2010. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 1-21 remain pending as amended above.

Initially, the objection to claims 6, 11, and 17 are believed to be fully addressed via the above-detailed amendments to claims 6, 11, and 17.

### **35 USC § 103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata et al. (U.S. Publication No. 20030023695) in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Publication No. 20070016647) and further in view of Spraggs (U.S. Patent. No. 6,941,454).

Initially, each of these rejections is respectfully traversed as the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or even suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in any of the pending claims.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to in part recite that “the sender and the recipient are each directly coupled to communicate with both the authentication server and the mail server”. Support for this amendment may be readily found in the present specification, see, e.g., arrows between these elements in Fig. 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach (or even suggest) the claimed combination of features such as set forth in claim 1, including for example, that

each of the sender and recipient are directly coupled to both servers. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining independent claims recite similar (though not identical) language as claim 1 and have been rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Hence, these remaining independent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (303-800-6678) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions, as well as includes the appropriate fee herewith (in the form of credit card authorization), to obtain a three-month extension of the period for responding to the Office action, thereby moving the deadline for response from August 25, 2010 to November 25, 2010 (and further to November 26, 2010 due to USPTO closure).

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890**

Telephone Number: 303-800-6678

Date 11/26/10

By /Ramin Aghevli – Reg. No. 43,462/  
Ramin Aghevli, Reg. No. 43,462